

The National Association of Home Builders want me to believe that exclusive and bulk billing agreements are good for competition during this time of economic uncertainty. NAHB make the following statement:

“Overall: Neither marketing not bulk billing arrangements are anticompetitive, since both arrangements allow residents freedom of choice in MVPD service, at no higher price or service level than the agreement that would be negotiated with a single household in the absence of such agreements.”

A question to the National Association of Home Builders, what they are you doing asking the FCC to leave the status quo in relation to exclusive marketing and bulk billing agreements? NAHB should be building houses not abusing their power during the period of declarant control to tie future homeowners to a long term bulk billing agreement. If the NAHB want to be in the telecommunication industry, I ask the FCC to regulate anyone who provides telecommunication services directly or indirectly. Yes, that includes the NAHB you can't resell telecoms, and not be regulated.

As a customer affected by a 75 year exclusive bulk service contract, I can tell you that a bulk billing arrangements are anticompetitive. I will use basic math to explain the NAHB how these agreements allowed residents freedom of choice at higher price. Right now, I pay \$146.00 for a bulk service thru my HOA while most people around my community pay \$99.00 without a 75 year bulk billing agreement. If I want to get service from Verizon with a cost of \$125.00 I will have pay \$271.00 vs. \$146.00 and at no point I will pay \$99.00 like people that live in the neighborhoods around my community. So much for “freedom of choice” in MVPD, PCO, DBS or special purpose entities created by developers” service, at no higher price NAHB.